

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending and under consideration. In the final Office Action of May 16, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *England* (U.S. 6,144,991) in view of *Bose* (U.S. 2002/0042830). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and address the Examiner's disposition below:

Independent claims 1, 7, 11, 17, 18, 21, and 24 each claim subject matter relating to a media stream that is part of an interactive presentation having interactive elements that a user is able to interact with during playback of the interactive presentation. A note of the media stream is edited while retaining the synchronization of the note at the particular time in the media stream.

This is clearly unlike *England* in view of *Bose*, which fails to disclose or suggest a media stream that is part of an interactive presentation having interactive elements that a user interacts with during playback of the interactive presentation. As acknowledged by the Examiner, *England* fails to teach a media stream that is part of an interactive presentation having interactive elements that a user interacts with during playback. *Office Action of 5/16/2008*, page 3. The Examiner argues that *Bose* teaches this claimed subject matter. Applicants disagree.

Referring to *Bose* [0095], *Bose* provides an Interactive Question and Answer (IQA) component that allows users to answer questions during a live session. *Bose* states that the live training session may be recorded for playback. *Bose* [0095]. However, nowhere does *Bose* teach or suggest that, during playback, a user may answer questions. Instead, *Bose*'s training session is merely recorded and then played back as a static training session, with no interaction from the user during playback. Therefore, *Bose*'s played back session does not include interactive elements that a user interacts with during playback of the presentation.

Therefore, *England* in view of *Bose* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 7, 11, 17, 18, 21, and 24.

Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-16, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, and 26 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 7, 11, 17, 18, 21, and 24 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 7, 11, 17, 18, 21, and 24 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-26 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg. No. 45,034)

Christopher P. Rauch
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P. O. Box 061080, Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
Telephone (312) 876 8000
Customer No. 26263